



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/503,067	02/12/2000	Nicholas R. Dono	YO-999-567	6067

35195 7590 05/18/2005

FERENCE & ASSOCIATES
409 BROAD STREET
PITTSBURGH, PA 15143

EXAMINER

CHANG, ERIC

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2116

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/503,067

Applicant(s)

DONO ET AL.

Examiner

Eric Chang

Art Unit

2116

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 March 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-5, 8-22 and 25-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-5, 8-22 and 25-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 3-5, 8-22 and 25-31 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. Claims 1, 3-5, 8-22 and 25-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,009,480 to Pleso, in view of U.S. Patent 6,167,567 to Chiles et al.

4. As to claim 1, Pleso discloses a self-describing peripheral device for being integrated with a computer operating system comprising:

[a] at least one hardware component in the device [52];

[b] at least one description subsystem in the device associated with at least one hardware component [72];

[c] said subsystem facilitates integration of said device with an operating system [col. 6, lines 52-62]; and

[d] said at least one description subsystem comprising interface logic for interpreting commands received over an interface between said device and a computer operating system [82], including determining if said device is known to said operating system [col. 8, lines 12-29] and providing a network location where said information may be obtained [col. 13, lines 26-35].

Pleso teaches the limitations of the claims, including means to update the self-descriptive information in the device, and providing a network location where said information may be obtained [col. 13, lines 33-35]. However, Pleso does not teach interface logic adapted to assist said device in obtaining a copy of the device driver.

Chiles teaches a device comprising a device driver, or other software or firmware, to be updated [col. 7, lines 48-59]. Thus, Chiles teaches a device with operating and integration information stored thereon similar to that of Pleso. Chiles further teaches the interface logic is adapted to assist a computer operating system in obtaining a copy of the device driver for installation in the device [col. 10, lines 13-28].

At the time that the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to employ the update method as taught by Chiles. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so that the identification information and device drivers stored on the device as taught by Pleso can be updated by said device.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of the cited references because they are both directed to the problem of storing device drivers and identification. Moreover, the update means taught by Chiles would improve the flexibility of Pleso because it allowed the update process to further comprise version upgrades and error handling.

5. As to claim 3, Pleso discloses the device comprises:

[a] non-volatile memory [72]; and

[b] interface logic being adapted to control said non-volatile memory [82].

Art Unit: 2116

6. As to claim 4, Pleso discloses the logic facilitates identification of said device [col. 6, lines 52-62].

7. As to claim 5, Pleso discloses the logic facilitates the provision of information to an operating system relating to the version of said device driver [col. 6, lines 52-62]. Pleso teaches the descriptive information contains the driver for the device; it is well known in the art that drivers usually comprise version information about themselves.

8. As to claim 8, Chiles discloses the logic facilitates the updating of a network location where a recent version of a device driver is obtainable [col. 31, lines 32-44].

9. As to claim 9, Chiles discloses the logic facilitates the updating of the device driver information stored on the device [col. 3, lines 10-24].

10. As to claim 10, Chiles further discloses logic that compares the locally stored device driver with a remotely stored device driver to determine which one is newer [col. 15, lines 61-67 and col. 16, lines 1-5] and to prompt usage of the newer version [col. 16, lines 22-24].

11. As to claim 11, Chiles further discloses logic that prompts usage of locally stored device driver if a remotely stored device driver is not accessible [col. 15, lines 1-17]. Chiles teaches that the user is notified and prompted if the connection to the remote device driver fails.

12. As to claim 12, Chiles further discloses logic that compares said locally stored device driver with a remotely stored device driver at predetermined time intervals [col. 15, lines 5-13 and col. 16, lines 32-43]. Chiles teaches that the logic automatically schedules a date for the next update to the device driver; that is, after the predetermined time interval as scheduled, the process to compare and update device drivers will once again occur.

13. As to claims 13-19, Pleso teaches the limitations of the claims but does not specifically teach the devices that can use the limitations.

Chiles teaches that device can be a modem, graphics card, or other computer peripheral with software and firmware updates made available by its manufacturer [col. 1, lines 62-67].

At the time that the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to employ the devices as taught by Chiles. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so that the devices are self-descriptive.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of the cited references because they are both directed to the problem of information stored on a non-volatile memory within a device. Moreover, the devices taught by Chiles would improve the utility of Pleso because it allowed his teachings to be applied to a variety of applications not disclosed by Pleso.

Furthermore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that such devices could further comprise a printer, a sound card, IDE/SCSI disk controller, or a network controller, substantially as claimed.

14. As to claim 20, Pleso discloses a method for integrating a self-describing peripheral device with a computer operating system, the method comprising:

[a] providing at least one hardware component in the device [52];

[b] providing at least one description subsystem in the device associated with at least one hardware component [72];

[c] adapting with said subsystem to facilitate integration of said device with an operating system [col. 6, lines 52-62] by interpreting commands received over an interface between said device and a computer operating system [82], including determining if said device is known to said operating system [col. 8, lines 12-29] and providing a network location where said information may be obtained [col. 13, lines 26-35].

Pleso teaches the limitations of the claims, including means to update the self-descriptive information in the device, and providing a network location where said information may be obtained [col. 13, lines 33-35]. However, Pleso does not teach interface logic adapted to assist said device in obtaining a copy of the device driver.

Chiles teaches a device comprising a device driver, or other software or firmware, to be updated [col. 7, lines 48-59]. Thus, Chiles teaches a device with operating and integration information stored thereon similar to that of Pleso. Chiles further teaches the interface logic is adapted to assist a computer operating system in obtaining a copy of the device driver for installation in the device [col. 10, lines 13-28].

At the time that the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to employ the update method as taught by Chiles. One of ordinary skill

Art Unit: 2116

in the art would have been motivated to do so that the identification information and device drivers stored on the device as taught by Pleso can be updated by said device.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of the cited references because they are both directed to the problem of storing device drivers and identification. Moreover, the update means taught by Chiles would improve the flexibility of Pleso because it allowed the update process to further comprise version upgrades and error handling.

15. As to claim 21, Pleso discloses the logic facilitates identification of said device [col. 6, lines 52-62].

16. As to claim 22, Pleso discloses the logic facilitates the provision of information to an operating system relating to the version of said device driver [col. 6, lines 52-62]. Pleso teaches the descriptive information contains the driver for the device; it is well known in the art that drivers usually comprise version information about themselves.

17. As to claim 25, Chiles discloses the logic facilitates the updating of a network location where a recent version of a device driver is obtainable [col. 31, lines 32-44].

18. As to claim 26, Chiles discloses the logic facilitates the updating of the device driver information stored on the device [col. 3, lines 10-24].

Art Unit: 2116

19. As to claims 27 and 30, Chiles further discloses logic that compares the locally stored device driver with a remotely stored device driver to determine which one is newer [col. 15, lines 61-67 and col. 16, lines 1-5] and to prompt usage of the newer version [col. 16, lines 22-24].

20. As to claim 28, Chiles further discloses logic that prompts usage of locally stored device driver if a remotely stored device driver is not accessible [col. 15, lines 1-17]. Chiles teaches that the user is notified and prompted if the connection to the remote device driver fails.

21. As to claim 29, Chiles further discloses logic that compares said locally stored device driver with a remotely stored device driver at predetermined time intervals [col. 15, lines 5-13 and col. 16, lines 32-43]. Chiles teaches that the logic automatically schedules a date for the next update to the device driver; that is, after the predetermined time interval as scheduled, the process to compare and update device drivers will once again occur.

22. As to claim 31, Pleso discloses a program of instructions stored in a program storage device comprising instructions for integrating a self-describing peripheral device with a computer operating system, the program comprising:

[a] providing at least one hardware component in the device [52];

[b] providing at least one description subsystem in the device associated with at least one hardware component [72];

[c] adapting with said subsystem to facilitate integration of said device with an operating system [col. 6, lines 52-62] by interpreting commands received over an interface between said

Art Unit: 2116

device and a computer operating system [82], including determining if said device is known to said operating system [col. 8, lines 12-29] and providing a network location where said information may be obtained [col. 13, lines 26-35].

Pleso teaches the limitations of the claims, including means to update the self-descriptive information in the device, and providing a network location where said information may be obtained [col. 13, lines 33-35]. However, Pleso does not teach interface logic adapted to assist said device in obtaining a copy of the device driver.

Chiles teaches a device comprising a device driver, or other software or firmware, to be updated [col. 7, lines 48-59]. Thus, Chiles teaches a device with operating and integration information stored thereon similar to that of Pleso. Chiles further teaches the interface logic is adapted to assist a computer operating system in obtaining a copy of the device driver for installation in the device [col. 10, lines 13-28].

At the time that the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to employ the update method as taught by Chiles. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so that the identification information and device drivers stored on the device as taught by Pleso can be updated by said device.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of the cited references because they are both directed to the problem of storing device drivers and identification. Moreover, the update means taught by Chiles would improve the flexibility of Pleso because it allowed the update process to further comprise version upgrades and error handling.

Art Unit: 2116

Response to Arguments

23. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-5, 8-22 and 25-31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.


Conclusion

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric Chang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3671. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynne Browne can be reached on (571) 272-3670. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

May 10, 2005
ec



**REHANA PERVEEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER**